

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

The applicant respectfully requests the admittance of this amendment. This amendment adds no new matter, and does not require an additional search. The amendment to claim 1 restores its original scope, including each of the originally claimed limitations, which were searched and examined in the first Office action in this case. The amendment to claim 10 merely replaces the term 'improving' with 'enhancing'; the intended scope of this claim is unchanged, and this amendment does not necessitate an additional search.

The Office action objects to claims 5 and 7; claims 5 and 7 are correspondingly amended herein. No new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, but in the interest of advancing prosecution in this case, claim 10 is amended herein to replace the term "improving" with "enhancing". No new matter is added, and the intended scope of the claim is unchanged.

The Office action rejects claims 1-2, 4, 6, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Okuyama et al. (USP 6,783,244, hereinafter Okuyama). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

MPEP 2131 states:

"A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The *identical invention* must be shown in as *complete detail* as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-9 depend, claims a projection device that includes a switchable module comprising at least a first submodule switchable between being active and inactive in the light path from a light source to an image projection means, wherein the first submodule is adapted to enhance centre brightness and white point of the light. Claim 10 includes similar limitations.

Okuyama fails to teach a switchable module in the light path from a light source to an image projection means that enhances centre brightness and white point of the light.

Okuyama specifically teaches selectable filters selectively applied to one or more of the three (R, G, B) luminance projection paths to enhance the color purity of the particular RGB color. Okuyama does not teach the use of a module that selectively enhances the centre brightness and the white point of a projection light, as specifically claimed in claims 1 and 10.

Because Okuyama fails to teach a module that selectively enhances the centre brightness and the white point of a projection light, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 6, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) over Okuyama.

The Office action rejects claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Yasugaki et al. (USP 5,479,224, hereinafter Yasugaki). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted above, claim 1, upon which claims 2-9 depend, claims a projection device that includes a switchable module comprising at least a first submodule switchable between being active and inactive in the light path from a light source to an image projection means, wherein the first submodule is adapted to enhance centre brightness and white point of the light.

Yasugaki fails to teach a submodule in the light path from a light source to an image projection means that is adapted to selectively enhance centre brightness and white point of the light.

Yasugaki teaches a head-mounted display that includes a lens system 13 that selectively provides three different magnifications of the displayed image. Yasugaki's lens system is not in the light path between a light source and an image projection means, and Yasugaki's lens system does not selectively enhance centre brightness and white point of the light. Yasugaki does not teach a light source and specifically teaches that the lens system 13 is placed in the path of the light from the display device 21.

Because Yasugaki fails to teach a submodule in the light path from a light source to an image projection means, and fails to teach that the submodule is adapted to selectively enhance centre brightness and white point of the light, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Yasugaki.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001